

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/696,794	10/30/2003	Cheng Chung Wang	10111395	8106	
34283	7590 01/24/2006		EXAMINER		
QUINTERO LAW OFFICE			HEWITT, JAMES M		
1617 BROADWAY, 3RD FLOOR SANTA MONICA, CA 90404			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	•		3679		

DATE MAILED: 01/24/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/696,794	WANG, CHENG CHUNG	
Examiner	Art Unit	
James M. Hewitt	3679	

	James M. Hewitt	3679	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	·
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Nor a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, aft tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire Is Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 70	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH 06.07(f).	g date of the final rejecti E FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	tension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply orig than three months after the mailing da	of the fee. The appropri inally set in the final Offi	iate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	o avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of the appeal. Since
AMENDMENTS			
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, I They raise new issues that would require further contains the proposed in the proposed in	nsideration and/or search (see NO		ecause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.13	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	:		
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be al non-allowable claim(s). 			•
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided that the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		ill be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1 and 6</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>2-5</u> .			
 AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	t before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	eal and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attacl	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. ☑ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s). <u>10/24/05</u>	
		•	

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 102/103 rejection of claims 1 and 6 in view of Kanzler (US 4.941.221).

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

To respond to Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Grudzinskas (US 4,619,481) and to clarify the Examiner's position, Grudzinskas' assembly depicted in Figure 21 constitutes the claimed air mattress, the upholstery and padding (of the chair) constitute the claimed mattress pad and the inflatable chambers within the upholstery constitutes the claimed back support. And given that Grudzinskas' assembly meets the definition of mattress is: 1 a: a fabric case filled with resilient material (as cotton, hair, feathers, foam rubber, or an arrangement of coiled springs) used either alone as a bed or on a bedstead b: an inflatable airtight sack for use as a mattress, Grudzinskas is considered to anticipate claim 1.

To respond to Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(b) by Wilhoit (US 5,771,514) and to clarify the Examiner's position, Wilhoit's device constitutes the claimed air mattress, the upholstery/padding (of the pillow) constitutes the claimed mattress pad, and one of the inflatable chambers (16, 18, 20) constitutes the claimed back support. And given that Wilhoit's device meets the definition of mattress is: 1 a: a fabric case filled with resilient material (as cotton, hair, feathers, foam rubber, or an arrangement of coiled springs) used either alone as a bed or on a bedstead b: an inflatable airtight sack for use as a mattress, Wilhoit is considered to anticipate claim 1.

To respond to Applicant's arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1 and 6 as being unpatentable over Collymore (US 6,298,511) in view of Wilhoit (US 5,771,514) and to clarify the Examiner's position, the motivation to modify Collymore with a built-in pump assembly as taught by Wilhoit is implicit to Wilhoit. One having ordinary skill in the art would know that an advantage to employing a built-in pump assembly instead of or in place of an external pump assembly would be a reduction in the number of components required to use the device. And as evidenced in Figure 3, Wilhoit's air pump assembly (12) is built into his mattress pad (the upholstery, padding, etc. of the pillow).

JAMES M. HEWITT